arXiv:solv-int/9703009v1 19 Mar 1997

Linearizability of the Perturbed Burgers Equation

R. A. Kraenkel, J. G. Pereira and E. C. de Rey Neto

Instituto de Física Teórica

Universidade Estadual Paulista

Rua Pamplona 145

01405-900 São Paulo

Brazil

Abstract

We show in this letter that the perturbed Burgers equation

$$u_t = 2uu_x + u_{xx} + \epsilon\left(3\alpha_1 u^2 u_x + 3\alpha_2 u u_{xx} + 3\alpha_3 u_x^2 + \alpha_4 u_{xxx}\right)$$

is equivalent, through a near-identity transformation and up to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, to a linearizable equation if the condition $3\alpha_1 - 3\alpha_3 - \frac{3}{2}\alpha_2 + \frac{3}{2}\alpha_4 = 0$ is satisfied. In the case this condition is not fulfilled, a normal form for the equation under consideration is given. Then, to illustrate our results, we make a linearizability analysis of the equations governing the dynamics of a one–dimensional gas.

PACS: 03.40.Kf

Key Words: Burgers Equation, Perturbation Theory, Integrability

I. INTRODUCTION

The object of this letter is the perturbed Burgers equation

$$u_t = 2uu_x + u_{xx} + \epsilon\left(3\alpha_1 u^2 u_x + 3\alpha_2 u u_{xx} + 3\alpha_3 u_x^2 + \alpha_4 u_{xxx}\right) \quad , \tag{1}$$

where α_i are constants, $\epsilon \ll 1$ is a perturbative parameter, and subscripts denote partial differentiation. It appears in the long-wave, small amplitude limit of extended systems dominated by dissipation, but where dispersion is also present at a higher order. More precisely, those systems described by equations whose linear part admits a dispersion relation of the form

$$\Omega\left(k\right) = a_3 k^3 + a_5 k^5 + \cdots + \imath\left(b_2 k^2 + b_4 k^4 + \cdots\right) \quad , \tag{2}$$

with a_i and b_i real constants. For example, Eq.(1) appears in the description of gas dynamics [1], and in certain cases of free-surface motion of waves in heated fluids [2]. More important, however, is the fact that the terms appearing at order ϵ are the only ones allowed if Eq.(1) is obtained from long-wave perturbation theory, and no constants are allowed to scale with ϵ. In this sense, it has the *universality* characteristics, much in the same way as the equations discussed by Calogero [3].

When the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ terms are discarded, we have simply Burgers equation, which is an equation linearizable through a Hopf–Cole transformation [4]. It is, thus, a natural question to ask whether Eq.(1) is also linearizable. Put in this way, the answer is that it is linearizable if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4$, in which case the equation is reduced to the sum of Burgers with the first higher–order equation of the Burgers hierarchy [5]. We notice in passing that the latter is also linearizable by the same Hopf–Cole transformation that linearizes the Burgers equation. However, we can put the question on a more general setting by introducing the idea of *near identity transformation* [6], that is, a transformation $u \to w$ of the form

$$u = w + \epsilon\phi\left(w\right) \quad . \tag{3}$$

If we apply such a transformation to Eq.(1), we may look for functions $\phi\left(w\right)$ such that the transformed equation reads:

$$w_t = 2ww_x + w_{xx} + \epsilon\lambda\left(3w^2w_x + 3ww_{xx} + 3w_x^2 + w_{xxx}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\epsilon^2\right) \quad , \tag{4}$$

for some $\lambda \in R$. If such a $\phi(w)$ exits, we say that Eq.(1) and Eq.(4) are equivalent up to order ϵ. As Eq.(4) is linearizable, so is Eq.(1) up to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$. The fundamental issue here is thus to determine the conditions for the existence of a near identity transformation (that is, $\phi(w)$) ensuring the equivalence, up to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, of equations (1) and (4). This is the question we will address in this letter, and an answer will be given in terms of a condition on the parameters α_1, α_2, α_3 and α_4.

The kind of equivalence defined above has been introduced in ref. [7] in the context of asymptotic evolution equations. For dispersive systems whose lowest order, in the long-wave approximation, is described by the Korteweg-de Vries (KdV) equation, it has been shown that there exists always a near-identity transformation which makes the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ perturbation integrable. The same is true for the case of the Nonlinear Schrödinger equation [8]. However, obstacles to integrability appear in $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ [8,9]. The same kind of ideas has been used in [10] to show that, in the KdV case, a $\phi(w)$ depending explicitly on x can be found as to completely remove the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ correction. We will come back to this issue at the end of this letter.

We will show that, in the case of Eq.(1), obstacles to linearizability appear already at $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$. We mean by this that, in general, Eq.(1) is not equivalent to Eq.(4). The condition for the equivalence will be shown to be

$$3\alpha_1 - 3\alpha_3 - \frac{3}{2}\alpha_2 + \frac{3}{2}\alpha_4 = 0 \quad . \tag{5}$$

Furthermore, in the case where condition (5) is not satisfied, we find a normal form for Eq.(1), that is, a form to which Eq.(1) can always be transformed. Finally, as an illustration, we make a linearizability analysis of the equations governing the dynamics of a one–dimensional gas, and we show that, already at order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, these equations can not be linearized.

II. LINEARIZABILITY ANALYSIS

Let us then implement the ideas exposed above. We want to insert Eq.(3) into Eq.(1), discard all $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ terms, and compare the result with Eq.(4). To do so, we have to specify the possible form of $\phi(w)$. They ought to be such as to generate, at $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, terms of the form $w^2 w_x$, $w w_{xx}$, w_x^2 and w_{xxx}. The allowable terms turn out to be w_x, w^2 and $w_x \partial^{-1} w$, where ∂^{-1} means integration in x. Thus the general form of $\phi(w)$ is :

$$\phi(w) = \alpha w_x + \beta w^2 + \gamma w_x \partial^{-1} w \quad , \tag{6}$$

where α, β and γ are constants to be determined.

We introduce now the following useful notations:

$$B(u) = 2uu_x + u_{xx} \quad , \tag{7}$$

and

$$\Theta(u) = 3\alpha_1 u^2 u_x + 3\alpha_2 u u_{xx} + 3\alpha_3 u_x^2 + \alpha_4 u_{xxx} \quad . \tag{8}$$

Accordingly, Eq.(1) becomes

$$u_t = B(u) + \epsilon\Theta(u) \quad . \tag{9}$$

The transformation (3) changes Eq.(9) to an equation in w, given by

$$w_t = B(w) + \epsilon\left\{\Theta(w) + [B(w), \phi(w)]\right\} + \mathcal{O}\left(\epsilon^2\right) \quad , \tag{10}$$

where

$$[B(w), \phi(w)] = \frac{\delta B}{\delta w}\phi - \frac{\delta \phi}{\delta w} B \quad .$$

In order to obtain the transformed equation, we have thus to calculate the commutator $[B(w), \phi(w)]$, which is the tedious part of our task. After performing that calculation, we get

$$[B(w), \phi(w)] = 2\beta w_x^2 + 2\gamma w w_{xx} + (2\beta + \gamma) w^2 w_x \quad . \tag{11}$$

Inserting this into Eq.(10), the transformed equation reads:

$$w_t = B(w) + \epsilon \Big[(2\beta + \gamma + 3\alpha_1) w^2 w_x \; + (2\gamma + 3\alpha_2) w w_{xx} + (2\beta + 3\alpha_3) w_x^2 + \alpha_4 w_{xxx} \Big] \quad . \tag{12}$$

If we now require Eq.(12) to be of the form given by Eq.(4), we have to take $\lambda = \alpha_4$, and the following conditions must be satisfied:

$$2\beta = 3\alpha_4 - 3\alpha_3 \quad , \tag{13}$$

$$2\gamma = 3\alpha_4 - 3\alpha_2 \quad , \tag{14}$$

$$2\beta + \gamma = 3\alpha_4 - 3\alpha_1 \quad . \tag{15}$$

Clearly, this system of equations is not always solvable. The solubility condition is

$$3\alpha_1 - 3\alpha_3 - \frac{3}{2}\alpha_2 + \frac{3}{2}\alpha_4 = 0 \quad , \tag{16}$$

in which case $\beta = \frac{3}{2}(\alpha_4 - \alpha_3)$ and $\gamma = \frac{3}{2}(\alpha_4 - \alpha_2)$. Note that α is left undetermined. Condition (16) is thus the condition that must be satisfied in order to make Eq.(1) equivalent, up to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, to Eq.(4).

Suppose now that Eq.(16) is not satisfied. The general form of the transformed equation is given by Eq.(12). The $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ terms can be written as the sum of a linearizable term proportional to $\alpha_4 F_3(w)$, with

$$F_3(w) = 3w^2 w_x + 3 w w_{xx} + 3 w_x^2 + w_{xxx} \quad , \tag{17}$$

plus a term $Z(w)$ representing the obstacle to linearizability, that is,

$$w_t = B(w) + \epsilon \alpha_4 F_3(w) + \epsilon Z(w) \quad , \tag{18}$$

where

$$Z(w) = (2\beta + 3\alpha_3 - 3\alpha_4) w_x^2 + (2\gamma + 3\alpha_2 - 3\alpha_4) w w_{xx} + (2\beta + \gamma + 3\alpha_1 - 3\alpha_4) w^2 w_x \quad . \tag{19}$$

If we call each of the coefficients appearing in the obstacle respectively by μ_1, μ_2 and μ_3, and if we further introduce ν_i through $\mu_i = \mu\nu_i$, with $\mu = 3\alpha_1 - 3\alpha_3 - \frac{3}{2}\alpha_2 + \frac{3}{2}\alpha_4$, then we may write out the *normal form* of Eq.(1) as:

$$w_t = B\left(w\right) + \epsilon\alpha_4 F_3\left(w\right) + \epsilon\mu\left(\nu_1 w_x^2 + \nu_2 w w_{xx} + \nu_3 w^2 w_x\right) \quad , \tag{20}$$

where ν_i are arbitrary constants satisfying

$$\nu_1 - \nu_3 + \frac{\nu_2}{2} = -1 \quad . \tag{21}$$

Equation (20) encompasses the main results of this letter: for $\mu = 0$ we have a linearizable equation, and for $\mu \neq 0$ it gives the general form to which Eq.(1) is equivalent up to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$.

III. GAS DYNAMICS

Let us consider the equations governing the dynamics of a one–dimensional gas [1]

$$\rho_t + \left(\rho u\right)_x = 0 \quad , \tag{22}$$

$$\left(\rho u\right)_t + \left[\rho u^2 + P - \mu u_x\right]_x = 0 \quad , \tag{23}$$

where $\rho(x,t)$ is the density, $u(x,t)$ is the velocity, μ is the viscosity, and

$$P = A\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0}\right)^{\gamma} \quad ,$$

is the pressure, with $\gamma = (c_p/c_v)$ the ratio of specific heats, and A a proportionality constant. In order to study its long–wave, small amplitude limit, we define slow space and time variables,

$$\xi = \epsilon(x - ct) \quad , \tag{24}$$

$$\tau = \epsilon^2 t \quad , \tag{25}$$

and scale the original (primed) density and velocity fields according to

$$\rho' = \rho_0 + \epsilon\rho \quad , \tag{26}$$

$$u' = \epsilon u \quad . \tag{27}$$

In terms of these new variables, Eqs.(22) and (23) becomes

$$\rho_0 u_\xi - c\rho_\xi + \epsilon\Big[\rho_\tau + (u\rho)_\xi\Big] = 0 \quad , \tag{28}$$

$$\frac{A\gamma}{\rho_0}\,\rho_\xi - c\rho_0 u_\xi + \epsilon\Big[- c(u\rho)_\xi + \rho_0 u_\tau + \rho_0 u_\tau + \rho_0(u^2)_\xi - \mu u_{\xi\xi}\Big] + \epsilon^2\Big[(u\rho)_\tau + (\rho u^2)_\xi\Big] = 0 \quad . \tag{29}$$

Moreover, as a compatibility condition at order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^0)$, we have to set

$$c^2 = \frac{A\gamma}{\rho_0} \quad . \tag{30}$$

Now, from Eq.(28) we obtain

$$\rho_\xi = \frac{\rho_0}{c}\,u_\xi + \frac{\epsilon}{c}\,[\rho_\tau + (u\rho)_\xi] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \quad , \tag{31}$$

or

$$\rho = \frac{\rho_0}{c}\left[u + \frac{\epsilon}{c}\left(u^2 - \partial^{-1}u_\tau\right)\right] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \quad , \tag{32}$$

with ∂^{-1} indicating an integration in the ξ coordinate. Substituting in Eq.(29), and using the resulting equation into itself, we are lead to

$$u_\tau = -uu_\xi + \frac{\mu}{2\rho_0}\,u_{\xi\xi} + \epsilon\left[\frac{1}{c}u^2u_\xi - \frac{3\mu}{2c\rho_0}uu_{\xi\xi} - \frac{\mu}{4c\rho_0}(u_\xi)^2 + \frac{\mu^2}{8c{\rho_0}^2}u_{\xi\xi\xi}\right] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \quad . \tag{33}$$

In order to compare to Eq.(1), we have first to rewrite Eq.(33) in a nondimensional form. To this end, we nondimensionalize all variables according to

$$u \longrightarrow \frac{u}{c} \quad ; \quad \xi \longrightarrow -\frac{\rho_0}{c\mu}\,\xi \quad ; \quad \tau \longrightarrow \frac{\rho_0}{2c^2\mu}\,\tau \quad . \tag{34}$$

In terms of these new variables, the nondimensional version of Eq.(33) reads

$$u_\tau = 2uu_\xi + u_{\xi\xi} + \epsilon\left[-\frac{2\rho_0}{A\gamma}u^2u_\xi - \frac{3\rho_0}{A\gamma}uu_{\xi\xi} - \frac{\rho_0}{2A\gamma}(u_\xi)^2 - \frac{\rho_0}{4A\gamma}u_{\xi\xi\xi}\right] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \quad . \tag{35}$$

A comparison with Eq.(1) yields

$$\alpha_1 = -\frac{2\rho_0}{3A\gamma} \;\; ; \;\; \alpha_2 = -\frac{\rho_0}{A\gamma} \;\; ; \;\; \alpha_3 = -\frac{\rho_0}{6A\gamma} \;\; ; \;\; \alpha_4 = -\frac{\rho_0}{4A\gamma} \;\; . \tag{36}$$

The linearizability condition (16), therefore, is

$$\frac{3\rho_0}{8A\gamma} = 0 \quad . \tag{37}$$

This means that, in the long–wave, small amplitude limit, the equation governing a one–dimensional gas can be linearized only at the lowest order. When the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ corrections are taken into account, the corresponding equation can not be linearized, indicating that obstacles to linearizability are present already at this order.

IV. FINAL REMARKS

The first remark is about the traveling–wave solution to the Burgers equation. Suppose that we want to know the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ correction to the solution

$$w = -k\left[1 - \tanh\left(kx - 2k^2 t\right)\right] \tag{38}$$

of the Burgers equation. What is remarkable about it is that we may take $Z(w) = 0$. That is, there exist constants ν_i, namely $\nu_1 = -\nu_2 = -\nu_3 = -\frac{2}{3}$, satisfying condition (21) such that the obstacle term in Eq.(20) is equal to zero. This makes it easy to find the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ correction to the solution (38) from the joint solution of Burgers and the first higher–order equation of the Burgers hierarchy, which can be verified to be:

$$w = -k\left\{1 - \tanh\left[kx - \left(2k^2 - 4\epsilon\alpha_4 k^3\right)t\right]\right\} \quad . \tag{39}$$

The second remark is about the more general transformation alluded to above. Following ref. [10], instead of (6), we may alternatively introduce

$$\phi(w) = \alpha w_x + \beta w^2 + \gamma w_x \partial^{-1} w + \nu x\left(w_{xx} + 2ww_x\right) \quad , \tag{40}$$

with ν a constant. This leads to the following normal form:

$$w_t = B\left(w\right) + \epsilon\left(\alpha_4 + 2\nu\right) F_3\left(w\right) + \epsilon\mu\left(\nu_1 w_x^2 + \nu_2 w w_{xx} + \nu_3 w^2 w_x\right) \quad , \tag{41}$$

where μ is not modified, relation (21) is still valid, but the coefficients ν_1 and ν_3 have new expressions in terms of the parameters defining the transformations. Explicitly, we have:

$$\nu_1 = \mu^{-1}\left(2\beta + 3\alpha_3 - 3\alpha_4 - 2\nu\right) \quad , \tag{42}$$

$$\nu_3 = \mu^{-1}\left(2\beta + \gamma + 3\alpha_1 - 3\alpha_4 - 2\nu\right) \quad . \tag{43}$$

The meaning of this result is the following: the new transformation (40) does not have any influence on the linearizability up to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ of Eq.(1), that is, it does not alter condition (16). But, it makes it possible to further simplify the normal form by taking $\nu = \alpha_4/2$. This completely eliminates the $F_3\left(w\right)$ term from Eq.(41).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank CNPq - Brazil, and FAPESP–Brazil for financial support.

REFERENCES

[1] R. K. Dodd, J. C. Eilbeck, J. D. Gibbon and H. C. Morris, *Solitons and Nonlinear Wave Equations* (Academic, London, 1982).

[2] R. A. Kraenkel, J. G. Pereira and M. A. Manna, Phys. Rev. A 45 (1992) 45.

[3] F. Calogero, *Why Are Certain Nonlinear PDEs Both Widely Applicable and Integrable*, in *What is Integrability*, ed. by V. E. Zakharov (Springer, Berlin, 1991).

[4] G. B. Whitham, *Linear and Nonlinear Waves* (Wiley, NY, 1973).

[5] D. V. Choodnovsky and G. V. Choodnovsky, Nuov. Cim. 40B (1977) 339.

[6] V. I. Arnold, *Geometrical Methods in the Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations* (Springer, Berlin, 1983).

[7] Y. Kodama, Phys. Lett. 112A (1985) 193.

[8] Y. Kodama and A. V. Mikhailov, *Obstacles to Asymptotic Integrability*, in *Algebraic Aspects of Integrable Systems*, ed. by A. S. Fokas and I. M. Gelfand (Birkhäuser, Basel, 1996).

[9] R. A. Kraenkel, M. A. Manna, J. C. Montero and J. G. Pereira, Phys. Rev. E (1996) 2976.

[10] A. S. Fokas and Q. M. Liu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1996) 2347.